



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,541	11/15/2001	Nga Marie Nguyen	50R4820	3048

7590 05/18/2006

JOHN L. ROGITZ
ROGITZ & ASSOCIATES
750 B STREET
SUITE 31220
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

EXAMINER

YIMAM, HARUN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/991,541

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN, NGA MARIE

Examiner

Harun M. Yimam

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Note to Applicant

Art Units 2611, 2614 and 2617 have changed to 2623. Please make all future correspondence indicate the new designation 2623.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant should note that the Examiner has removed Proehl (2005/0154988) as a reference against this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-16, 19, 20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wugofski (WO 99/35843).

Considering claims 1, 9, and 19, Wugofski discloses a system and a corresponding method for presenting television station content and non-television station content on a TV (see figure 6), comprising:

a TV (PC/TV system—page 5, lines 12-15); and a channel metaphor device coupled to the TV (DBS receiver—page 6, lines 13-16), the channel metaphor device receiving signals from a television signal provider (broadcast sources—page 10, lines 10-13), wherein

at least some of the signals originate at television stations and are associated with respective channel numbers (broadcast sources—page 10, lines 10-13 and see figure 6), and

the channel metaphor device also receiving at least one non-television station signal (web page—see figure 6 i.e., WWW NBC) having an associated channel number (see 312 in figure 3 and page 11, lines 12-15),

at least some of the channel numbers (02, 04 and 07 in figure 6) being associated with the television stations (PBS, FOX and NBC respectively – figure 6) and at least the channel number being associated with the non-television station signal (312 in figure 3 and page 11, lines 12-15) being dynamically established by the television signal provider (see figures 2, 5A and 5B and page 8, line 16 – page 9, line 14), some of the signals from the television signal provider from time to time indicating changes in channel numbers including changes in the channel number associated with the non-television station signal (page 10, line 14 - page 11, line 6 and page 16, lines 6-9).

As for claims 2, 10 and 20, Wugofski discloses that the non-television station signal is a Web page from the Internet (page 15, lines 18-21).

Regarding claims 4, 12 and 22, Wugofski discloses that the channel associated with the non-television station signal is associated with at least one rating (PG 13—318 in figure 3 and page 11, lines 3-15).

Considering claims 5, 13 and 23, Wugofski discloses that the non-television station signal is selectively displayed on the TV based on the rating (when a user selects to display their favorite channel, they are listed based on their rating—page 11, lines 3-15).

As for claims 6, 14, Wugofski discloses that a user of the system can prevent display of a channel associated with the non-television station signal based on the rating (the parental lock feature, 318 in figure 3, prevents a user from accessing non-television content that is not met by their stored graphical and behavioral attributes—page 11, lines 3-15).

With regards to claims 7, 15 and 24, Wugofski discloses that the channel associated with the non-television station signal can be designated as a "favorite"

channel (see figure 3 and page 11, lines 7-15) using an input device (pointing device/remote control 114 in figure 1 and page 7, lines 12-16).

Regarding claims 8 and 16, Wugofski discloses a remote control user input device (pointing device/remote control 114 in figure 1 and page 7, lines 12-16), the remote control user input device not being a computer keyboard and being the only user input device associated with the TV except for channel, volume, and TV setting controls located on a housing of the TV.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski (WO 99/35843) in view of Miller (US 5,585,866).

With regards to claims 3, 11 and 21, Wugofski discloses that the non-television station signal is a service selected from the group including television set up services (designating particular channels as favorite channels—see figure 3 and page 11, lines

7-15) and computer input device simulation services (116 in figure 1 and page 7, lines 16-19).

Wugofski fails to further disclose that the non-television station signal is a service selected from the group including game services as well as music services.

In analogous art, Miller discloses that the non-television station signal is a service selected from the group including game services (column 28, line 62 – column 29, line 45) as well as music services (column 28, line 62 – column 29, line 10 and column 30, lines 23-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wugofski's system to include game and music services in the selection group, as taught by Miller, for the benefit of presenting multiple services to the user along with the television content.

6. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota (US 2001/0047518).

Considering claims 17 and 18, Wugofski discloses a channel metaphor device coupled to the TV (DBS receiver—page 6, lines 13-16).

Wugofski fails to disclose that the channel metaphor device (DBS receiver) is embodied in the TV.

In analogous art, Sahota discloses a channel metaphor device (set-top-box) embodied in a TV (paragraph 0025, lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Wugofski's system to include televisions with built-in set-top-boxes, as taught by Sahota, for the benefit of reducing the number of physical devices in a home network.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harun M. Yimam whose telephone number is 571-272-7260. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/991,541

Page 9

Art Unit: 2623

HMY



**CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**